

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

OCT 02 2006

PATENT

Appl. No. 10/731,620
Amdt. dated October 2, 2006
Reply to Office Action of June 1, 2006

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action mailed June 1, 2006. Claims 1-14 were pending in the present application. This Amendment amends claim 1, without adding or canceling any claims, leaving pending in the application claims 1-14. Reconsideration of the rejected claims is respectfully requested.

I. Objection to the Claims

Claims 3, 8, 10, 12, 13, and 14 are objected to as reciting the term "meta metadata object." Applicants respectfully submit that this term is as intended, and is described in the Applicants' specification, such as in paragraphs [0021]-[0026]. A "meta metadata object" is the subject of metadata validation on which a validation rule is defined (paragraph [0021]). Since "meta" data generally refers to "data about data", data about metadata for validation purposes can be referred to as "meta metadata", with such an object being a "meta metadata object" as referred to and defined in the specification. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the objection with respect to claims 3, 8, 10, 12, 13, and 14 be withdrawn.

II. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by *Mikhailov* (US Patent No. 6,968,500). Applicants respectfully submit that *Mikhailov* does not disclose each element of these claims.

For example, Applicants' claim 1 as amended recites a metadata validation system for validating an object model, the system comprising:

- a client device configured to receive user input and provide a user interface to a user;
- a database for storing objects corresponding to the object model and metadata describing the object model;
- a configuration management module for creating a deployable collection of objects using the object model; and
- a validation engine for validating the metadata in the database, wherein said validation engine is configured to perform completeness validation on a validation subject in response to a user entered command to perform validation on the validation subject, to automatically perform correctness validation on a validation subject when the subject is created or updated, and to automatically perform completeness and correctness validation on a validation subject when requested by the configuration management module

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

OCT 02 2006

PATENT

Appl. No. 10/731,620
Amdt. dated October 2, 2006
Reply to Office Action of June 1, 2006

(*emphasis added*). Such limitations are not disclosed by *Mikhailov*.

Mikhailov discloses an automatic forms handling system, which can receive a form from a form publisher including one or more data submission fields and associate each of those submission fields with a database field type supported by a database application (col. 2, line 37-col. 3, line 37). Form service definitions from the form publisher may be stored as metadata associated with the corresponding database table (col. 5, lines 39-54). It is asserted in the office action that validation of this metadata in a database, particularly as the validation is recited in claim 1, is shown in col. 15, lines 8-58 of *Mikhailov*. Applicants respectfully submit that this process of *Mikhailov* instead determines if the data entered into one of the existing forms is valid (col. 15, lines 9-13; lines 39-51). This process is not doing a validation of the metadata for the form, corresponding to service definitions for the form as stored in the database, but instead is determining whether data entered into an existing form by a user is valid for that data entry field. As such, *Mikhailov* cannot anticipate Applicants' claim 1, or the claims that depend therefrom. Independent claims 8 and 14 recite limitations that similarly are not disclosed by *Mikhailov*, and further disclose meta metadata objects, as discussed above, which are not disclosed by *Mikhailov*, such that *Mikhailov* cannot anticipate claims 8 and 14, or the claims that depend therefrom. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the rejection with respect to claims 1-14 be withdrawn.

III. Amendment to the Claims

Unless otherwise specified, amendments to the claims are made for purposes of clarity, and are not intended to alter the scope of the claims or limit any equivalents thereof. The amendments are supported by the specification and do not add new matter.

CONCLUSION


In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

Appl. No. 10/731,620
Amdt. dated October 2, 2006
Reply to Office Action of June 1, 2006

PATENT

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 415-576-0200.

Respectfully submitted,



Jason D. Lohr
Reg. No. 48,163

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 415-576-0200
Fax: 415-576-0300
Attachments
JDL:jdj
60881808 v1